MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That may be done.

Remission of Wet Assessment on lands under certain tanks in Ramasamudra in Chamarajanagar Taluk.

MESSRS. K. V. VEERANNA and GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH (Malvalli Taluk); SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH (Mysore Taluk); T.M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); C. DASAPPA (Heggaddevankote Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI (Minorities); B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk); H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA (Mandya Taluk); PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA (Yelandur Jahgir); K. KEMPE GOWDA (Mandya Municipality); A. THAMMAYYA (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests) and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk).—

Q.—9. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) Is it a fact that the raiyats holding lands under Doddakere, Chikkakere, Sindagere, Kodimolekere, etc., of Ramasamudra, Chamarajanagar Taluk, presented petitions to Government stating that there was a failure of crops owing to the tanks not having received sufficient supply of water in time and praying for remission of wet assessment; and if so, when?

(*b*) Was remission sanctioned as prayed for by the petitioners?

(*c*) What is the report of the Amildar in this matter? Will the Government be pleased to place this on the table of this House?

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI).—

A.—(*a*) A petition was presented to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, on 10th January 1935, by the raiyats holding lands under the Sindagere tank.

(*b*) and (*c*) The matter is under correspondence.

MR. K. V. VEERANNA.—Is it not a fact that the raiyats presented a petition to the Revenue Commissioner in person in October 1934?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Notice.

MR. K. V. VEERANNA.—Would the Government ascertain from the Revenue Commissioner and let us know what has happened to that petition?

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO).—It is difficult to expect orders to be passed on petitions submitted long before the commencement of the collection season.

MR. K. V. VEERANNA.—Is it usual to grant remissions after the collection season? In view of the delay that has occurred in this case, will the Revenue Commissioner at least issue stay orders until orders are passed on the petition?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—As the First Member of Council stated yesterday, local revenue officers may themselves stay collection in cases in which remissions have been recommended.

MR. K. V. VEERANNA.—Remissions have been recommended in respect of lands under the Sindagere tank only. Does it mean that no remissions are called for in respect of lands under all the other tanks referred to in question (*a*)?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—No. In a number of cases remissions have been recommended even without applications from the raiyats concerned.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it not a fact that even in respect of lands for which remissions have been recommended the local officers have been taking coercive steps and proceeding with collections?

THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MYSORE DISTRICT (MR. B.T. KESAVA IYENGAR).—As I informed the House yesterday, instructions have been issued to the Amildars concerned that collections should be restricted to only a half of the demand in respect of the lands for which remissions are recommended.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it not a fact that in those very cases the full demand is being collected actually? Will it not therefore be beneficial to the raiyats if circular instructions are issued to all the Amildars?

MR. B. T. KESAVA IYENGAR.—That will be done.

Leavy of Fines on Inspectors and Village Revenue Officials in Nanjangud Sub-Division.

MESSRS. B. CHAMAIYA (Seringapatam Taluk); H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH (Malvalli Taluk); SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH (Mysore Taluk); T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); C. DASAPPA (Heggaddevankote Taluk); GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI (Minorities); B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk); H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA (Mandya Taluk); PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA (Yelandur Jahgir); K. KEMPE GOWDA (Mandya Municipality); A. THAMMAYYA (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests) and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk).—

Q.—15. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) What is the total amount of fine levied and collected from the Revenue Inspectors and village officials in Nanjangud Sub-Division by the present Sub-Division Officer during his term of office?

(*b*) What is the amount of fine levied on them during *jamabandy*?

(*c*) Have explanations been obtained from the above officials before the fines were inflicted; if so, in how many cases?

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI).—*A.*—(*a*)—

	Rs.	a.	p.
Amount levied ...	2,873	9	0
Amount collected	1,496	12	0

(*b*) Rs. 1,694-5-0.

(*c*) Yes, generally. In some cases, the Revenue Inspectors are reported to have been fined on their diaries and certain records in which they had been involved, and the village officials for absence during *jamabandy*.

MR. B. CHAMAIYA.—How long is the officer in question in charge of the Nanjangud Sub-Division?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Notice.

MR. B. CHAMAIYA.—With reference to answer to (*c*), may I know why explanations were not obtained from some of the officials?

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO).—No fresh explanations were considered necessary in cases in which the available records already contained explanations.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—How many Patels and how many Shanbhogues were punished by the Sub-Division Officer?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—The number of officials punished includes Patels, Shanbhogues and also Revenue Inspectors. Details are not readily available.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Would it be possible to give a rough idea of the proportion of Patels and Shanbhogues who were fined?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—Probably 2 to 1.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it not a fact that action has not been taken for years together to prosecute Shanbhogues who have been ordered to be prosecuted for misappropriation of funds?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—Notice.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it not a fact that punishment is meted out very promptly in the case of Patels?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—That does not arise from the question before the House.

MR. N. VEERARAJ URS.—The reason why so many village officials were fined is said to be that they were not present during *jamabandy*. But fines have also been levied on Patels who were present but were unable to show satisfactory collections. In view of the fact that the Patels were present at *jamabandy*, would it not be just to excuse the fines levied on them?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—That is a matter in which the aggrieved parties might go up in appeal.

MR. N. VEERARAJ URS.—Is it not desirable to issue confidential circulars